

A

**REDACTED**

B

**REDACTED**

C

**REDACTED**

D

1                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                   FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE  
3

4   - - - - - X

5   SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC.,           :  
6   a California corporation,         :  
7                   Plaintiff,         :  
8   v.                                 :

COPY

                                     : Civil Action No.  
                                     : 04-1199-SLR

9   INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS,       :  
10   INC., a Delaware corporation,   :  
11   INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS,       :  
12   INC., a Georgia corporation,     :  
13   and SYMANTEC CORPORATION,       :  
14   a Delaware corporation,         :  
15                   Defendants.       :

Volume 1

16   - - - - - X

17                   Washington, D.C.

18                   Friday, June 9, 2006

19  
20                   Video deposition of STEPHEN G. KUNIN,

21   ESQ., a witness herein, called for examination by

Page 1



1 Q. Less than twelve months?

2 A. Yes. It was within twelve months.

3 Q. Within twelve months. If I could direct  
4 your attention now to Exhibit 701.

5 A. (Complies.)

6 Q. Is this "Live Traffic" paper -- again,  
7 assuming the March 1998 publication date is  
8 correct, would this "Live Traffic" paper qualify  
9 as prior art under any category of art identified  
10 in Section 102?

11 MR. GREWAL: Objection. Calls for  
12 speculation.

13 THE WITNESS: I don't see a basis for  
14 where it would qualify as prior art under 102.

15 BY MR. HORVATH:

16 Q. Would it qualify as prior art under any  
17 section of the patent laws that you are aware of?

18 MR. GREWAL: Objection. Calls for  
19 speculation.

20 THE WITNESS: I would have -- I would  
21 have to speculate to give you an answer.

Page 109

E

**REDACTED**